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## Framework

Policymakers must maximize utility. 4 reasons.

A. Act-omission distinction doesn’t apply to states.

**Sunstein and Vermuele 5** write[[1]](#footnote-1)

The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among **possible policies for regulating third parties. The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context,** and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act. **Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action** – for example, private killing – **becomes obscure when government** formally **forbids private action but chooses a** set of **policy** instruments **that do[es] not** adequately or **fully discourage it.**

B. The traditional Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum mechanics holds that light waves instantaneously collapse into particles, which is a finite length over zero time, which is impossible. Only the Many-Worlds Interpretation escapes this dilemma and is thus more consistent with the rest of physics. **Vaidman 2**[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The reason for adopting the [Many-Worlds Interpretation]** MWI **is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate** is a physical law that **differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves** some kind of **action at a distance.** According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions of the Universe prior to the experiment: only the probabilities are governed by the initial state. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions. **There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI. We need not assume that Nature plays dice. The MWI is a deterministic theory** for a physical Universe **and it explains why a world appears** to be **indeterministic for** human **observers.**

MWI undermines the notion of personal identity. **Vaidman 2**[[3]](#footnote-3)

“I” am an object, such as Earth, cat, etc. **“I” is defined at a particular time by a complete (classical) description of the state of my body** and of my brain. “I” and “Lev” do not name the same things (even though my name is Lev). **At the present moment there are many different [me’s]** “Lev”s **in different worlds** (not more than one in each world), but it is meaningless to say that now there is another “I”. I have a particular, well defined past: I correspond to a particular “Lev” in 2002, but **I do not have a well defined future: I correspond to a multitude of [me’s]** “Lev”s in 2010. In the framework of the MWI it is meaningless to ask: Which Lev in 2010 will I be? I will correspond to them all. Every time I perform a quantum experiment (with several possible results) it only seems to me that I obtain a single definite result. Indeed, Lev who obtains this particular result thinks this way. However, this Lev cannot be identified as the only Lev after the experiment. Lev before the experiment corresponds to all “Lev”s obtaining all possible results. Although this approach to the concept of personal identity seems somewhat unusual, it is plausible in the light of the critique of personal identity by Parfit 1986. Parfit considers some artificial situations in which a person splits into several copies, and argues that there is no good answer to the question: Which copy is me? He concludes that **personal identity is not what matters when I divide.**

In the absence of personal identity, only end states can matter. **Shoemaker 99**[[4]](#footnote-4)

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Util**itarianism **is just such a theory.**

C. Knowledge reduces to merely true belief. “Reliable” sources of justification aren’t necessary for the goal of epistemology, or finding true beliefs. **Sartwell 91**[[5]](#footnote-5)

It is widely held that **our epistemic goal** with regard to particular propositions **is achieving** true beliefs and avoiding false ones about propositions with which we are epistemically concerned. (We have seen that Alston, for one, endorses that view.) That is, it is widely admitted that on any good account of justification, there must be reason to think that the **beliefs** justified on the account are **likely to be true.** Indeed, proponents of all the major conceptions of justification hold this position. For example, the foundationalist Paul Moser writes: [E]pistemic justification is essentially related to the so-called cognitive goal of truth, insofar as an individual belief is epistemically justified only if it is appropriately directed toward the goal of truth. More specifically, on the present conception, one is epistemically justified in believing a proposition only if one has good reason to believe it is true.(22) The reliabilist Alvin Goldman claims, similarly, that a condition on an account of justification is that beliefs justified on the account be likely to be true; he says that a plausible conception of justification will be "truth-linked."(23) And the coherentist Laurence BonJour puts it even more strongly: If epistemic justification were not conducive to truth in this way, if finding epistemically justified beliefs did not substantially increase the likelihood of finding true ones, epistemic justification would be irrelevant to our main cognitive goal and of dubious worth. It is only if we have some reason to think that epistemic justification constitutes a path to truth that we as cognitive human beings have any motive for preferring epistemically justified beliefs to epistemically unjustified ones. **Epistemic justification is therefore** in the final analysis **only an instrumental value, not** an **intrinsic** one.(24) In fact, it is often enough taken to be the distinguishing mark of the fact that we are epistemically concerned with a proposition that we are concerned with its truth or falsity. That is what, on the view of many philosophers, distinguishes epistemic from moral or prudential constraints on belief, what distinguishes inquiry from other belief-generating procedures. (If the theory I gave in the first chapter is right, ther are no non-epistemic belief-generating procedures in this sense. That fact merely underscores the present point.) I have argued that a **plausible normative epistemology will be teleological**. And I have claimed that the conception which accounts of knowledge are attempting to analyze or describe is that of the epistemic telos with regard to particular propositions. It would follow that, if a philosopher holds that the epistemic telos is merely true belief, that philosopher implicitly commits himself, his own asservations to the contrary, to the view that knowledge is merely true belief. I think that this is the case. I think, that is, that in the above passages, these philosophers have committed themselves implicitly to the view that knowledge is merely true belief, and that justification is a criterion rather than a logically necessary condition of knowledge. By a criterion, to repeat, I mean a test for whether some item has some property that is not itself a logically necessary condition of that item's having that property. Justification on the present view is, first of all, a means by which we achieve knowledge, that is, by which we arrive at true beliefs, and second, it provides a test of whether someone has knowledge, that is, whether her beliefs are true. So again, the present view does not make accounts of justification trivial, or unconnected with the assessment of claims to know. If our epistemic goal with regard to particular propositions is true belief, then justification (a) gives procedures by which true beliefs are obtained, and (b) gives standards for evaluating the products of such procedures with regard to that goal. From the point of view of (a), justification prescribes techniques by which knowledge is gained. From the point of view of (b) it gives a criterion for knowledge. But in neither case does it describe a logically necessary condition for knowledge. Another way of putting the matter is like this. If we describe justification as of merely instrumental value with regard to arriving at truth, as BonJour does explicitly, we can no longer maintain both that knowledge is the telos of inquiry and that justification is a necessary condition of knowledge. It is incoherent to build a specification of what are regarded merely as means of achieving some goal into the description of the goal itself; in such circumstances **the goal can be described independently of the means.** So if justification is demanded because it is instrumental to true belief, it cannot also be maintained that knowledge is justified true belief. I will now certainly be accused of begging the question by assuming that knowledge is the goal of inquiry. There is justice in this claim in that I have not gone very far toward establishing the point. But I would ask my accusers at this point whether they can do better in describing the conception which theories of knowledge set out to analyze or describe without begging the question in favor of some such theory. And I ask also, if knowledge is not the overarching epistemic telos with regard to particular propositions, why such tremendous emphasis has been placed on the theory of knowledge in the history of philosophy, and just what function that notion serves within that history. If knowledge is not the overarching purpose of inquiry, then why is the notion important, and why should we continue to be concerned in normative epistemology above all with what knowledge is and how it can be achieved? If we want to withold the term `knowledge' from mere true belief, but also want to hold that mere true belief is the purpose of inquiry, then I suggest that what remains is a mere verbal dispute. That is, if we treat mere true belief as the purpose of inquiry, but do not equate it with knowledge, then I do not think that knowledge is any longer central to normative epistemology. And I would insist that we are not going to understand what `knowledge' means in the tradition, in Plato and Descartes, for example, if we do not regard them as holding knowledge to be the goal of inquiry. In fact, if it is allowed that mere true belief is the telos of inquiry, but that we should still reserve the term `knowledge' for justified true belief (and perhaps something more), I will simply abandon the term `knowledge' to the epistemology of justification. But first of all, as I suggested in the third chapter, I think that `knowledge' will now merely be a technical term with a stipulated definition. And second, I do not think it will be central to epistemology, since it no longer represents our epistemic goal. And third, I think the stipulated definition will either be redundant (if justification is held to be truth conducive) or, as I will argue, incoherent (if it is not). Now it may well be held that justification is of more than instrumental value, because if we are not justified in believing p, though p is true and we in fact believe it, we may have false beliefs that lead us to p, and we may continue to generate false beliefs in the future. All of this is true, but it is irrelevant to the present point. Recall that I have characterized knowledge as our epistemic goal with regard to particular propositions. Insofar as p is concerned, this goal has been realized if p is true and we believe it. Insofar as we have also such goals as continuing to generate true beliefs, rendering our system of beliefs coherent, and so forth, it is desirable to have justified beliefs. But with regard to any particular proposition, our goal has been reached if we believe that proposition and it is true. But I do not want simply to let the matter rest on a supposed agreement among some contemporary epistemologists that our epistemic goal with regard to particular propositions is true belief. Such epistemologists are agreed that knowledge is at least justified true belief. I think that Alston is right to think that the only plausible way to construe this claim is that **knowledge is** at least **true belief** based on adequate grounds, or true belief **reached from a strong position.** So perhaps the figures in question, on reflection, would describe the epistemic telos not as true belief but as true belief based on adequate grounds, or true belief reached from a strong position. Only it must now be asked, why do we want to have adequate grounds? Why do we want to be in a strong position? This question ought to be misguided if true belief based on adequate grounds or true belief reached from a strong position is in fact the purpose of inquiry. For there is no good answer to the question of why we desire our ultimate ends. **But** the question is hardly misguided. In fact, we cannot even specify what it is to have adequate grounds except that these grounds tend to establish that the proposition in question is true; **we cannot** even **specify** what it is to be in **a strong position except as being in a strong position to get the truth.** This indicates that **the purpose of inquiry can be formulated without reference to** the notions of ground or **position.** Thus, on the views in question, believing the truth is in fact our overarching epistemic telos with regard to particular propositions, on the only plausible conception of justification. **Hence,** on these views, **knowledge is merely true belief.**

Util coheres with the fact that knowledge reduces to mere true belief.

**Petersen 11**[[6]](#footnote-6)

To ask “why is knowledge of more instrumental value than mere true belief?” is, on this picture, like asking “why are earned proﬁts of more instrumental value than monetary windfalls?” The answer to the ﬁnancial version of this question is clearly that the earnings are not more valuable. By analogy, then, neither is knowledge. The epistemic utilitarian embraces this conclusion and denies the intuition that knowledge is better than mere true belief, even on the instrumental version of the value question. The reason, illustrated by the analogy, is fairly simple: like anything but welfare, epistemic states are at best of instrumental value, and (as we noted earlier) generalizations about instrumental value only make sense under uncertainty. Generally charity is more valuable than murder, but **to** the classical **util**itarian (and to the classical utilitarian alone) **it is not sensible to ask “why is** a **charit[y]**able act **more valuable than** a **murder that results in the same** amount of **utility?”** To assume there is an answer here begs the question against the utilitarian. The same goes, one step down the instrumental chain, for the question “why are earnings more valuable than windfalls?” **Under uncertainty, investments with high expected** monetary **value are** in an important, instrumental sense **more valuable than those with poor expected** monetary **value, but** this question builds in the assumption that **both result in the same monetary value** (given of course that all else is equal). Finally, **the same goes for knowledge and lucky-but-true belief**; in the description of the case, both have gotten the relevant epistemic (instrumental) good. To stipulate that, despite the odds, luck-sensitive belief formation nonetheless resulted in a true belief is just like stipulating that the murder under consideration ended up net beneﬁtting people, or that the stupid casino bet ended up paying off.

D. Revisionary intuitionism is true and leads to util.

**Yudkowsky 8** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

I haven't said much about metaethics - the nature of morality - because that has a forward dependency on a discussion of the Mind Projection Fallacy that I haven't gotten to yet. I used to be very confused about metaethics. After my confusion finally cleared up, I did a postmortem on my previous thoughts. I found that my object-level moral reasoning had been valuable and my **meta-level moral reasoning had been worse than useless.** And this appears to be a general syndrome - **people do much better when discussing whether torture is** good or **bad than when they discuss the meaning of "good" and "bad". Thus, I deem it prudent to keep moral discussions on the object level** wherever I possibly can. Occasionally **people object** to any discussion of morality on the grounds **that morality doesn't exist**, and in lieu of jumping over the forward dependency to explain that **"exist" is not the right term to use** here, I generally say, "But **what do you do anyway?**" and **take the discussion back down to the object level.** Paul Gowder, though, has pointed out that both the idea of choosing a googolplex dust specks in a googolplex eyes over 50 years of torture for one person, and the idea of "utilitarianism", depend on "intuition". He says I've argued that the two are not compatible, but charges me with failing to argue for the utilitarian intuitions that I appeal to. Now "intuition" is not how I would describe the computations that underlie human morality and distinguish us, as moralists, from an ideal philosopher of perfect emptiness and/or a rock. But I am okay with using the word "intuition" as a term of art, bearing in mind that "intuition" in this sense is not to be contrasted to reason, but is, rather, the cognitive building block out of which both long verbal arguments and fast perceptual arguments are constructed. **I see** the project of **morality as a project of renormalizing intuition.** We have intuitions about things that seem desirable or undesirable, intuitions about actions that are right or wrong, intuitions about how to resolve conflicting intuitions, intuitions about how to systematize specific intuitions into general principles. **Delete all** the **intuitions, and** you aren't left with an ideal philosopher of perfect emptiness, **you're left with a rock. Keep all your** specific **intuitions and** refuse to build upon the reflective ones, and you aren't left with an ideal philosopher of perfect spontaneity and genuineness, **you're left with a** grunting **caveperson** running in circles, due to cyclical preferences and similar inconsistencies. "Intuition", as a term of art, is not a curse word when it comes to morality - there is nothing else to argue from. **Even modus ponens is an "intuition"** in this sense - **it**'s **just** that modus ponens **still seems like a good idea after being** formalized, **reflected on**, extrapolated out to see if it has sensible consequences, etcetera. So that is "intuition". However, Gowder did not say what he meant by "utilitarianism". Does utilitarianism say... That right actions are strictly determined by good consequences? That praiseworthy actions depend on justifiable expectations of good consequences? That probabilities of consequences should normatively be discounted by their probability, so that a 50% probability of something bad should weigh exactly half as much in our tradeoffs? That virtuous actions always correspond to maximizing expected utility under some utility function? That two harmful events are worse than one? That two independent occurrences of a harm (not to the same person, not interacting with each other) are exactly twice as bad as one? That for any two harms A and B, with A much worse than B, there exists some tiny probability such that gambling on this probability of A is preferable to a certainty of B? If you say that I advocate something, or that my argument depends on something, and that it is wrong, do please specify what this thingy is... anyway, I accept 3, 5, 6, and 7, but not 4; I am not sure about the phrasing of 1; and 2 is true, I guess, but phrased in a rather solipsistic and selfish fashion: you should not worry about being praiseworthy. Now, what are the "intuitions" upon which my "utilitarianism" depends? This is a deepish sort of topic, but I'll take a quick stab at it. First of all, it's not just that someone presented me with a list of statements like those above, and I decided which ones sounded "intuitive". Among other things, **if you try to violate** "**util**itarianism", **you run into paradoxes, contradictions**, circular preferences, **and other** things that aren't **symptoms of** moral wrongness so much as **moral incoherence.** After you think about moral problems for a while, and also find new truths about the world, and even discover disturbing facts about how you yourself work, you often end up with different moral opinions than when you started out. This does not quite define moral progress, but it is how we experience moral progress. As part of my experienced moral progress, I've drawn a conceptual separation between questions of type Where should we go? and questions of type How should we get there? (Could that be what Gowder means by saying I'm "utilitarian"?) The question of where a road goes - where it leads - you can answer by traveling the road and finding out. If you have a false belief about where the road leads, this falsity can be destroyed by the truth in a very direct and straightforward manner. When it comes to wanting to go to a particular place, this want is not entirely immune from the destructive powers of truth. You could go there and find that you regret it afterward (which does not define moral error, but is how we experience moral error). But, even so, wanting to be in a particular place seems worth distinguishing from wanting to take a particular road to a particular place. Our intuitions about where to go are arguable enough, but our intuitions about how to get there are frankly messed up. **After** the two hundred and eighty-seventh **research** study **showing that people will chop their own feet off if you frame the problem the wrong way, you start to distrust first impressions. When you've read enough research on scope insensitivity** - people will pay only 28% more to protect all 57 wilderness areas in Ontario than one area, **people will pay the same amount to save 50,000 lives as 5,000 lives**... that sort of thing... Well, the worst case of scope insensitivity I've ever heard of was described here by Slovic: Other recent research shows similar results. Two Israeli psychologists asked people to contribute to a costly life-saving treatment. They could offer that contribution to a group of eight sick children, or to an individual child selected from the group. The target amount needed to save the child (or children) was the same in both cases. Contributions to individual group members far outweighed the contributions to the entire group. There's other research along similar lines, but I'm just presenting one example, 'cause, y'know, eight examples would probably have less impact. If you know the general experimental paradigm, then the reason for the above behavior is pretty obvious - focusing your attention on a single child creates more emotional arousal than trying to distribute attention around eight children simultaneously. So people are willing to pay more to help one child than to help eight. Now, **you could** look at this intuition, and **think it was** revealing **some** kind of **incredibly deep moral truth** which shows that one child's good fortune is somehow devalued by the other children's good fortune. But what about the billions of other children in the world? Why isn't it a bad idea to help this one child, when that causes the value of all the other children to go down? How can it be significantly better to have 1,329,342,410 happy children than 1,329,342,409, but then somewhat worse to have seven more at 1,329,342,417? **Or you could** look at that and **say: "The intuition is wrong: the brain can't** successfully **multiply** by eight and get a larger quantity than it started with. **But it ought to**, normatively speaking." And once you realize that the brain can't multiply by eight, then the other cases of scope neglect stop seeming to reveal some fundamental truth about 50,000 lives being worth just the same effort as 5,000 lives, or whatever. You don't get the impression you're looking at the revelation of a deep moral truth about nonagglomerative utilities. It's just that the brain doesn't goddamn multiply. Quantities get thrown out the window. If you have $100 to spend, and you spend $20 each on each of 5 efforts to save 5,000 lives, you will do worse than if you spend $100 on a single effort to save 50,000 lives. Likewise if such choices are made by 10 different people, rather than the same person. As soon as you start believing that it is better to save 50,000 lives than 25,000 lives, that simple preference of final destinations has implications for the choice of paths, when you consider five different events that save 5,000 lives. (It is a general principle that Bayesians see no difference between the long-run answer and the short-run answer; you never get two different answers from computing the same question two different ways. But the long run is a helpful intuition pump, so I am talking about it anyway.) The aggregative valuation strategy of "shut up and multiply" arises from the simple preference to have more of something - to save as many lives as possible - when you have to describe general principles for choosing more than once, acting more than once, planning at more than one time. Aggregation also arises from claiming that the local choice to save one life doesn't depend on how many lives already exist, far away on the other side of the planet, or far away on the other side of the universe. Three lives are one and one and one. No matter how many billions are doing better, or doing worse. 3 = 1 + 1 + 1, no matter what other quantities you add to both sides of the equation. And if you add another life you get 4 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1. That's aggregation. **When you've read enough** heuristics and **biases research, and enough coherence** and uniqueness **proofs for** Bayesian probabilities and **expected utility**, and you've seen the "Dutch book" and "money pump" effects that penalize trying to handle uncertain outcomes any other way, **then you don't see** the **preference reversals** in the Allais Paradox **as** revealing **some** incredibly **deep moral truth** about the intrinsic value of certainty. **It just goes to show that the brain doesn't** goddamn **multiply.** The primitive, perceptual intuitions that make a choice "feel good" don't handle probabilistic pathways through time very skillfully, especially when the probabilities have been expressed symbolically rather than experienced as a frequency. So you reflect, devise more trustworthy logics, and think it through in words. When you see people insisting that no amount of money whatsoever is worth a single human life, and then driving an extra mile to save $10; or when you see people insisting that no amount of money is worth a decrement of health, and then choosing the cheapest health insurance available; then you don't think that their protestations reveal some deep truth about incommensurable utilities. Part of it, clearly, is that **primitive intuitions don't successfully diminish the emotional impact of** symbols standing for **small quantities** - anything you talk about seems like "an amount worth considering". And part of it has to do with preferring unconditional social rules to conditional social rules. Conditional rules seem weaker, seem more subject to manipulation. If there's any loophole that lets the government legally commit torture, then the government will drive a truck through that loophole. So it seems like there should be an unconditional social injunction against preferring money to life, and no "but" following it. Not even "but a thousand dollars isn't worth a 0.0000000001% probability of saving a life". Though the latter choice, of course, is revealed every time we sneeze without calling a doctor. The rhetoric of sacredness gets bonus points for seeming to express an unlimited commitment, an unconditional refusal that signals trustworthiness and refusal to compromise. So you conclude that moral rhetoric espouses qualitative distinctions, because espousing a quantitative tradeoff would sound like you were plotting to defect. On such occasions, people vigorously want to throw quantities out the window, and they get upset if you try to bring quantities back in, because quantities sound like conditions that would weaken the rule. But you don't conclude that there are actually two tiers of utility with lexical ordering. You don't conclude that there is actually an infinitely sharp moral gradient, some atom that moves a Planck distance (in our continuous physical universe) and sends a utility from 0 to infinity. You don't conclude that utilities must be expressed using hyper-real numbers. Because the lower tier would simply vanish in any equation. It would never be worth the tiniest effort to recalculate for it. All decisions would be determined by the upper tier, and all thought spent thinking about the upper tier only, if the upper tier genuinely had lexical priority. As Peter Norvig once pointed out, if Asimov's robots had strict priority for the First Law of Robotics ("A robot shall not harm a human being, nor through inaction allow a human being to come to harm") then no robot's behavior would ever show any sign of the other two Laws; there would always be some tiny First Law factor that would be sufficient to determine the decision. Whatever value is worth thinking about at all, must be worth trading off against all other values worth thinking about, because thought itself is a limited resource that must be traded off. When you reveal a value, you reveal a utility. I don't say that morality should always be simple. I've already said that the meaning of music is more than happiness alone, more than just a pleasure center lighting up. I would rather see music composed by people than by nonsentient machine learning algorithms, so that someone should have the joy of composition; I care about the journey, as well as the destination. And I am ready to hear if you tell me that the value of music is deeper, and involves more complications, than I realize - that the valuation of this one event is more complex than I know. But that's for one event. When it comes to multiplying by quantities and probabilities, complication is to be avoided - at least if you care more about the destination than the journey. **When you've reflected** on enough intuitions, **and corrected enough absurdities, you** start to **see a common denominator, a meta-principle** at work, **which one might phrase as "Shut up and multiply."** Where music is concerned, I care about the journey. When lives are at stake, I shut up and multiply. It is more important that lives be saved, than that we conform to any particular ritual in saving them. And the optimal path to that destination is governed by laws that are simple, because they are math. **And that's why I'm a utilitarian** - at least when I am doing something that is overwhelmingly more important than my own feelings about it - which is most of the time, because there are not many utilitarians, and many things left undone.

However, preference util is best. Impartiality is key and entails the consideration of everyone’s preferences. 2 reasons.

A. Preference util is required by the logical consistency of moral statements.

**Singer 09** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

Hare was a non-cognitivist. He held that moral judgments do not describe the world, and in that sense cannot be true or false, as ordinary descriptive statements can be. They are prescriptions, which means they belong to the broad family of imperatives. In Freedom and Reason, published in 1963, Hare argues that the freedom we have to make up our own minds about what is right or wrong lies in the fact that we choose what we shall prescribe. That choice, however, is not unconstrained. Reason enters the picture both because there can be logical relations between prescriptions, and because moral judgments are universalizable. If I say “Shut all the windows!” and “Leave the central window open!” I contradict myself. I also contradict myself if I say “All tax cheats ought to be imprisoned” and “I am a tax cheat, but I ought not to be imprisoned.” Universalizability means that, in Hare’s words: **One cannot with logical consistency**, where a and b are are two individuals, **say that a ought**, in a certain situation specified in universal terms without reference to individuals, **to act in a certain way**, also specified in universal terms, **but that b ought not** to **act in a similar**ly specified **way in a similar**ly specified **situation.** This is because in any ‘ought’-statement there is implicit a principle which says that **the statement applies to all** precisely **similar situations**. This means that **if I say ‘This is what ought to be done**; **but there could be a situation** exactly like this one in its non-moral properties, but **in which the** corresponding **person, who was exactly like the person who ought to do it** in this situation, **ought not** to **do it’, I contradict** myself. Moral judgments, in other words, cannot be based on just any reason. In particular, **we cannot make exceptions for ourselves**. If I claim that you ought to give to the poor, I must either agree that I too ought to give to the poor, or I must find a reason why it is not the case that I ought to give to the poor, and this reason must be specifiable without reference to individuals. That reason might be that you are a billionaire and I am struggling to keep up with my mortgage payments. But it cannot be that I am the one who will benefit if I keep all my money, whereas you will benefit if you keep all your money. Although Hare’s words sometimes gave the impression that he understood universalizability to be a requirement of reason (for example: “to universalize is to give the reason”) his considered position leaves room for amoralism, and the amoralist, in his view, need not be inconsistent or irrational. Moral language excludes non-universalizable judgments, but there is no logical requirement that one use moral language, or guide one’s life by universalizable principles. If that is right, the significance of any conclusions that we may be able to reach by drawing out the implications of universalizability will be weakened. One can always escape those conclusions by refusing to make moral judgments. Nevertheless, since many of us do want to use terms like “ought” and “right,” the possibility of rational amoralism does not render pointless the exercise of exploring the implications of universalizability, and seeing what normative conclusions may follow from its application. **When I prescribe something**, using moral language, **my prescription commits me to a** substantive moral **judgment about all** relevantly **similar cases. This includes hypothetical cases in which I am in a different position from my actual one. So to make a moral judgment, I must put myself in the position of** the other person affected by my proposed action – or to be more precise, in the position of **all those affected** by my action. Whether I can accept the judgment – that is, whether I can prescribe it universally – will then depend on whether I could accept it if I had to live the lives of all those affected by the action. That sounds as if universalizable moral judgments will have to be based on considering the preferences or interests of all affected – **which would mean** that we can arrive very rapidly at a form of **util**itarianism **based on maximizing** the **satisfaction of preferences** or interests. But Hare did not arrive at utilitarianism so swiftly. In Freedom and Reason he raises the issue of whether it is wrong for a woman to take a well-paid job undressing herself a at a strip club. The stripper prefers the work to anything else she can get, and those in the audience enjoy the performance. As far as interests are concerned, Hare tells us, “since everybody gets what he or she wants, nobody’s interests are harmed.” Nevertheless, that does not settle the moral issue, Hare tells us, because “it is a question not of interests but of ideals.” Some hold ideas of how a person should behave – or perhaps, how a woman should behave - that are incompatible with undressing for the sexual enjoyment of strangers. Hare considers the possibility of confining the moral terms to questions concerning the impact of our actions on other people’s interests, but he rejects such a “terminological fiat” on the grounds that such a restriction “would truncate moral philosophy by preventing it saying anything about ideals.” In the same work, Hare makes a similar statement about a Nazi who asserts that all Jews should be killed. This prescription commits the Nazi to prescribing that he himself should be killed, in the hypothetical case in which he discovers that he is a Jew. Since, we assume, the interests of Jews in continuing to live are greater than the interests of Nazis in killing them, no one would prefer to live the lives of all those affected by the prescription that all Jews be killed. Nevertheless, Hare says, a Nazi could be so fanatical about his belief in racial purity that he would think that he should be killed, even if he were a Jew. If he accepts that, he is not violating universalizability. Instead, in Hare’s words, “the fanatic nails his flag to the content of the ideal, irrespective of its holder.” Development of Hare’s Argument: Final Form In “Ethical Theory and Utilitarianism,” published in 1976, Hare took the argument an important step further. He had, he wrote discovered how “to deal in an agreeably clear way with the problem of the fanatic, who has given me so much trouble in the past.” Here is how he thought this could be done: In so far as, in order to prescribe universally, I have to strip away (qua author of the moral decision) all my present desires etc., I shall have to strip away, among them, all the ideals that I have; for an ideal is a kind of desire or liking (in the generic sense in which I am using those terms) … This does not mean that I have to give up having ideals, nor even that I must stop giving any consideration to my ideals when I make my moral decisions; it means only that I am not allowed to take them into account qua author of the moral decision. It is, of course, only when I can take my ideals into account qua ideals – that is, as something other than interests – that ideals can trump interests. If I can only take them into account as some kind of desire or liking, the content of the ideal no longer matters. Ideals are then treated simply as another kind of preference. When Hare revisits the example of the fanatical Nazi, he shows how this works. Now, he says: …the only sort of fanatic that is going to bother us is the person whose ideals are so intensely pursued that the weight that has to be given to them, considered impartially, outbalances the combined weights of all the ideals, desires, likings, etc. that have to be frustrated in order to achieve them. No actual Nazi could possibly have desired the extermination of Jews with sufficient intensity to outweigh all the desires of the Jews to continue to live, so this kind of fanatic is quite fantastic. Since our moral intuitions in fantastic situations are, Hare argues, unreliable, such fanatics need not trouble us.

B. People must abstract from their social position, entailing impartially considering everyone’s interests. Moral statements by definition are impartial.

**Harsanyi 77** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

**This equiprobability model** of moral value judgments **gives us** both a powerful analytical criterion and **a** very **convenient heuristic** criterion **for** deciding **practical moral problems**. If we want to decide between two alternative moral standards A and B, all we have to do is ask ourselves the question, ‘**Would I prefer to live in a society conforming to standard A or** in a society conforming to standard **B? – assuming I would not know in advance what my** actual **social position would be** in either society but rather would have to assume to have an equal chance of ending up in any one of the possible positions.’ Admittedly, this criterion – or any conceivable moral criterion – will still leave each of us with the great moral responsibility, and the often very difficult intellectual task, of actually choosing between these two alternative moral standards in terms of this criterion. But by using this criterion we will know at least what the actual intellectual problem is that we are trying to solve in choosing between them. My equiprobability model was first published in 1953, and was extended in 1955. Vickrey had suggested a similar idea, but my work was independent of his. Later John **Rawls** again independently **proposed a very similar model**, which he called the ‘original position’, based on the ‘veil of ignorance’. **But** while my own model served as a basis for a utilitarian theory, Rawls derived very nonutilitarian conclusions from his own. Yet the difference does not lie in the nature of the two models, which are based on almost identical qualitative assumptions. Rather, the difference lies in the decision-theoretical analysis applied to the two models. One difference is that Rawls avoids any use of numerical probabilities. But the main difference is that **Rawls makes the technical mistake of basing his analysis on a highly irrational decision rule, the maximin principle**, which was fairly fashionable thirty years ago but **which lost its attraction** a few years later **when its absurd practical implications were realised**. Our model of moral value judgments can also be described as follows. Each individual has two very different sets of preferences. On the one hand, he has his personal preferences, which guide his everyday behaviour and which are expressed in his utility function U. **Most people’s personal preferences** will not be completely selfish. But they will **assign higher weights to their own interests and** to the interests of **their family,** their **friends, and other** personal **associates** than they will assign to the interests of complete strangers. On the other hand, **each individual will also have moral preferences which** may or may not have much influence on his everyday behaviour but which will **guide his thinking in** those – possibly very rare – moments when he forces **a special impersonal and impartial attitude**, that is, a moral attitude, upon himself. **His moral preferences**, unlike his personal preferences, **will by definition** always **assign the same weight to all individuals’ interests**, including his own. These **moral preferences will be expressed by** his **social-welfare function W**. Typically, different individuals will have very different utility functions Ui but, as can be seen from Equation (1) above, in theory they will tend to have identical social-welfare functions – but only if they agree in their factual assumptions on the nature of the individual utility functions Ui and on the conversion rations between different individuals’ utilities (as decided by interpersonal utility comparisons) – which, of course, may not be the case. By definition, a moral value judgment is always an expression of one’s moral preferences. **Any evaluative statement** one may make **will automatically lose its status of a moral** value **judgment if** it is **unduly influenced by** one’s personal interests and **personal preferences.**

Given the MWI, preference util requires considering the evolutionarily robust aesthetic preferences of everyone in the multiverse.

**Tomasik 14** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

According to Max Tegmark's "Parallel Universes," there's probably an exact copy of you reading this article within 101028 meters away and in practice, probably much closer. As Tegmark explains, this claim assumes only basic physics that most cosmologists take for granted. Even nearer than this distance are many people very similar to you but with minor variations -- e.g., with brown eyes instead of blue, or who prefer virtue ethics over deontology. In fact, **all possible people exist** somewhere **in the multiverse**, if only due to random fluctuations of the type that produce Boltzmann brains. Nick Bostrom calls these "freak observers." Just as there are art maximizers, there are also art minimizers who find art disgusting and want to eliminate as much of it as possible. For them, the thought of art triggers their brains' disgust centers instead of beauty centers. However, the distribution of organisms across the multiverse is not uniform. For instance, we should expect suffering reducers to be much more common than suffering increasers because organisms evolve to dislike suffering by themselves, their kin, and their reciprocal trading partners. Societies -- whether human or alien -- should often develop norms against cruelty for collective benefit. **Human values** give us some **hint**s **about what values across the multiverse look like, because human values are a kind of maximum likelihood estimator** for the mode of the multiversal distribution. Of course, we should expect some variation about the mode. Even among humans, some cultural norms are distinct and others are universal. Probably values like not murdering, not causing unnecessary suffering, not stealing, etc. are more common among aliens than, say, the value of music or dance, which might be human-specific spandrels. Still, aliens may have their own spandrels that they call "art," and they might value those things. Like human values, alien values might be mostly self-directed toward their own wellbeing, especially in their earlier Darwinian phases. **Unless we meet the aliens face-to-face, we can't improve their welfare directly. However, the aliens may** also **have** some **outward-directed aesthetic** and moral **values that apply across space and time**, like the value of art as seen by the art-maximizing cities on Mars in the previous section. If so, **we can affect** the **satisfaction of these preferences by our actions, and** presumably **they should be included in preference-util**itarian **calc**ulations**.** As an example, suppose there were 10 civilizations. All 10 valued reducing suffering and social equality. 5 of the 10 also valued generating knowledge. Only 1 of the 10 valued creating paintings and poetry. Suppose our civilization values all of those things. Perhaps previously we were going to spend money on creating more poetry, because our citizens value that highly. However, upon considering that poetry would not satisfy the preferences of the other civilizations, we might switch more toward knowledge and especially toward suffering reduction and equality promotion. In general, **considering** the distribution of **outward-directed preferences across the multiverse should lead us to favor** more those **preferences** of ours **that are more evolutionarily robust,** i.e., **that we predict more civilizations to have settled upon**. One corollary is that we should care less about values that we have due to particular, idiosyncratic historical contingencies, such as who happened to win some very closely contested war, or what species were killed by a random asteroid strike. Values based on more inevitable historical trends should matter relatively more strongly.

Aesthetic preferences are important to our util calc even if they don’t directly correspond to pleasurable experiences.

**Tomasik 14** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

In practice, most of people's preferences concern their own hedonic wellbeing. Some also concern the wellbeing of their children and friends, although often these preferences are manifested through direct happiness or suffering in oneself (e.g., being on the edge of your seat with anxiety when your 14-year-old daughter hasn't come home by midnight). However, **some preferences are beyond hedonic experience** by oneself. **This is true** of preferences about how the world will be after one dies, or whether the money you donated to that charity actually gets used well even if you wouldn't find out either way. It's true **of many moral convictions**. For instance, I want to actually reduce expected suffering rather than hook up to a machine that makes me think I reduced expected suffering and then blisses me out for the rest of my life. **It's also true of** some **aesthetic preferences, such as the view that it would be good for art**, music, and knowledge **to exist even if no one was around to experience them. Certainly** these **non-hedonic preferences have hedonic effects**. If I learned that I was going to be hooked up to a machine that would erase my moral convictions and bliss me out for the rest of my life, I would feel upset in the short run. **However,** almost certainly this aversive feeling would be outweighed by my pleasure and lack of suffering in the long run. So my preference conflicts with egoistic hedonism in this case. (My preference not to be blissed out is consistent with hedonistic utilitarianism, rather than hedonistic egoism, but hedonistic utilitarianism is a kind of moral system that exists outside the realm of hedonic preferences of an individual organism.) Because preference utilitarians believe that **preference violations can be harmful even if they aren't accompanied by negative hedonic experience,** there are some cases in which doing something that other people disapprove of is bad even if they never find out. **For example, Muslims** strongly **oppose defacing the Quran.** This means that, barring countervailing factors, **it would be prima facie bad to deface a Quran** in the privacy of your own home **even if no one else knew about it.**

Thus the standard is **maximizing aesthetic preference satisfaction**.

## Advocacy

I advocate that developing countries should accept the Precautionary Principle on resource extraction issues. I reserve the right to clarify.

## Contention

I contend prioritizing environmental protection is key to satisfying aesthetic preferences.

Evolution proves. People have an aesthetic preference for the beauty of the environment.

**Chamberlin 2k** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

**The archaeological record** of the last Ice Age, particularly after about 40,000 years ago, **documents** the emergence of clearly symbolic behaviour, including burials that were furnished with grave goods, the **invention of** parietal and portable **representational art**, the use of items of body ornamentation and possible instances of numerical or calendrical notation (Pfeiffer, 1982). This kind of material cultural evidence has informed and stimulated the discussion of the evolution of modern human cognitive abilities, but **there is also an important aesthetic dimension to human culture**, and as Kaplan (1992) has emphasised, evolutionary explanations of human aesthetic preferences benefit from integrated approaches that consider both cognitive and emotional responses. On both theoretical and empirical grounds it is likely that human emotional adaptations evolved much earlier than strictly symbolic capacities, given that 99% of the five million year timespan of hominid evolution preceded the emergence of material evidence for symbolic behaviour. Thus the study of **human aesthetic preferences may provide a window into** an extensive epoch in the **early evolution of the human psyche**. In this paper I review some human visual aesthetic **preferences that may have originated in our species’** distant **evolutionary past**. These preferences **include evolved responses to natural landscapes**, symmetry preferences, and criteria of facial attractiveness. In the discussion that follows I employ a very general definition of aesthetics, best summarised as "mental appreciation of the shape or embellishment imposed on raw materials" (cf. Dissanayake, 1992), in which the term "appreciation" primarily denotes an involuntary emotional response to a stimulus, rather than the deliberate intellectual stance adopted by the modern professional or philosophical aesthete. Landscape Preferences and the Hominid Environment of Evolutionary Adaptiveness An innate human preference for visual landscapes that have properties resembling those of savanna habitats (i.e. low-relief, sparsely-wooded tropical grasslands: Figure 1a & b) has been attributed to selection pressures operating during early human evolution (Balling & Falk, 1982; Orians & Heerwagen, 1992). According to Orians and Heerwagen, **present-day humans express a rapid and** often **unconscious affective response to** those general properties of **a landscape** that are perceived **on initial visual encounter. Preferred landscapes are those containing features indicative of environmental conditions favourable for survival, such as an abundance of subsistence resources** or a minimal threat from predators. The preference for savanna-style visual landscapes is most strongly expressed in children (Balling & Falk, 1982), and is also manifest in the deliberate design of artificial landscapes as exemplified by modern (i.e. post-Renaissance) ornamental parks and gardens (Kaplan, 1992). A more specific hypothesis of landscape preference stems from "prospect-refuge theory", which predicts that within a given landscape preferred locations are found at interfaces between prospect-dominant and refuge-dominant areas (Appleton, 1996). These vantage points combine unimpeded visual prospects with a ready opportunity for concealment and/or withdrawal to a safe refuge. Thus a treeless landscape is less visually attractive than a habitat containing isolated trees that can provide opportunities to hide or escape from potential predators.

Prioritizing environmental protection over resource extraction is key.

**Halsey 13** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

In serious ecological design, I believe, **we need to redirect our vision to the functional aesthetic of natural systems**. In the design process we must follow all the steps in the scale of permanence and apply our design process in a manner that redefines our personal aesthetic to a more natural expectation. Using a structure of decision-making, from large-scale patterns to details as they are justified, does this. Following an organic design process allows us to discover the design solutions rather than impose them. In order to do ecological design in a sustainable manner we follow a functional aesthetic as nature does. What we perceive as **beauty in nature is** the functional anesthetic that is **the result of** billions of choices as solutions to **efficiency and fitness of living organisms**. These patterns that repeat in our vision show us the most efficient use of space, resources, transportation of resources, and resilience. Organism fitness is directly related to its ability to thrive in its niche. Each cell, each genetic mutation, either increases or decreases the fitness of the affected organism. The simplicity of design for the most efficient use of space, resources, and structural resilience, must also be sufficient to allow the system to survive changes in a niche, be they as in our world, climactic, geological, meteorological, or through competition with other systems. When we as Permaculture designers begin to read the land, **we want to make sure that** we are being imprinted by the land so that **our design is not** imprinted (**forced**) **on the land. That is why** the **assessment** process, in site-assessment, **cannot be motivated by extraction of resources. We are only looking for available resources that we may enhance, restore, and integrate in a design that will increase** the **fitness of the land** and its ability to buffer extreme events, which may deplete its resources. Within the boundaries of the property for which we are making a master plan, we are the new genetic code. We are like a virus in its most positive sense. We as ecological designers can supply a “new genetic code” bringing increased resilience to a property. **We can help the land restore itself to natural fertility**. We can assist the land in developing deeper and richer organic material on its horizon. As stated in many permaculture articles, we accelerate succession. **We must see ourselves as a steward of the land, not its master**. By increasing the ecological services availableto the natural systems we create increased resources for ourselves. We are the primary livestock in this natural system, yet as the stewards of this land we know that if we were to vacate the property, the natural systems will be more resilient, deeper in organic materials, and at a higher state of natural restoration than if we had never appeared. There will be increased diversity of flora and fauna and increased levels of complexity in the ecology.

The PP is key to solving environmental harms. We can’t afford to wait for scientific certainty. **SEHN 98** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

What is the precautionary principle? A comprehensive definition of the precautionary principle was spelled out in a January 1998 meeting of scientists, lawyers, policy makers and environmentalists at Wingspread, headquarters of the Johnson Foundation in Racine, Wisconsin. **The Wingspread Statement** on the Precautionary Principle, **summarizes the principle** this way**: "When an activity raises threats of harm to the environment** or human health, **precautionary measures should be taken even if** some **cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically."** Key elements of the principle include taking precaution in the face of scientific uncertainty; exploring alternatives to possibly harmful actions; placing the burden of proof on proponents of an activity rather than on victims or potential victims of the activity; and using democratic processes to carry out and enforce the principle - including the public right to informed consent. Is there some special meaning for "precaution"? It's the common sense idea behind many adages: "Be careful." "Better safe than sorry." "Look before you leap." "First do no harm." What about "scientific uncertainty"? Why should we take action before science tells us what is harmful or what is causing harm? **Sometimes if we wait for proof it is too late**. Scientific standards for demonstrating cause and effect are very high. For example, smoking was strongly suspected of causing lung cancer long before the link was demonstrated conclusively - that is, to the satisfaction of scientific standards of cause and effect. By then, many smokers had died of lung cancer. But many other people had already quit smoking because of the growing evidence that smoking was linked to lung cancer. These people were wisely exercising precaution despite some scientific uncertainty. **Often a problem** - such as a cluster of cancer cases or global warming - **is too large**, its causes too diverse, or the effects too long term **to be sorted out with scientific experiments** that would prove cause and effect. It's hard to take these problems into the laboratory. Instead, **we have to rely on** observations, case studies or **predictions based on current knowledge.** According to the precautionary principle, when substantial scientific evidence of any kind gives us good reason to believe that an activity, technology or substance may be harmful, we should act to prevent harm. **If we always wait for scientific certainty, people may suffer and die, and damage to the natural world may be irreversible.** We have lots of environmental regulations. Aren't we already exercising precaution? In some cases, to some extent, yes. When federal money is to be used in a major project, such as building a road on forested land or developing federal waste programs, the planners must produce an "environmental impact statement" to show how it will affect the surroundings. Then the public has a right to help determine whether the study has been thorough and all the alternatives considered. That is a precautionary action. But most environmental regulations, such as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and the Superfund Law, are aimed at cleaning up pollution and controlling the amount of it released into the environment. They regulate toxic substances as they are emitted rather than limiting their use or production in the first place. These laws have served an important purpose - they have given us cleaner air, water and land. But they are based on the assumption that humans and ecosystems can absorb a certain amount of contamination without being harmed. We are now learning how difficult it is to know what levels of contamination, if any, are safe. Many of our food and drug laws and practices are more precautionary. Before a drug is introduced into the marketplace, the manufacturer must demonstrate that it is safe and effective. Then people must be told about risks and side effects before they use it. But there are some major loopholes in our regulations. If the precautionary principle were universally applied, many toxic substances, contaminants, and unsafe practices would not be produced or used in the first place. The precautionary principle concentrates on prevention rather than cure. How would **the p**recautionary **p**rinciple change that without bringing the economy to a halt? It **would encourage** the **exploration of** alternatives - better, safer, cheaper ways to do things- and the development of **"cleaner" products and technologies.** Sometimes simply slowing down in order to learn more about potential harm is the best alternative. **It would shift the burden of proof** from the public **to proponents of a technology.** The principle would ensure that the public knows about and has a say in the deployment of technologies that may be hazardous. **Proponents would have to demonstrate** through an open process **that** a **tech**nology **was safe or necessary and that no better alternatives were available.**

Infinite values don’t paralyze calculation. **Lauwers and Vallentyne 04** write[[15]](#footnote-15)

**Zero Independence holds that the ranking of two worlds is determined by** the pattern of **differences in local value. This**, we claim, **is highly plausible** in the context of finitely additive value theories. In the finite case, finitely additive value theories always satisfy Zero Independence. Although they typically get expressed as judging a world as at least as good as another (having the same locations) if and only if its total value is at least as great, the **reference to the total is not needed.** An equivalent statement is that one world as at least as good as the second if and only if the sum of the differences in value is at least as great as zero. **Only the pattern of differences matters**. **Even in the infinite case**, Zero Independence is “partially” implied by Sum and Loose Pareto. Sum ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if Sum ranks U-V as at least as good as its zero world. Moreover, if two worlds U and V satisfy the antecedent clause of Loose Pareto, then Loose Pareto ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if it ranks U-V above its zero world. Zero Independence is thus, we claim, highly plausible for finitely additive theories.

Zero Independence is equivalent to a condition in social choice theory known as Translation Scale Invariance when it is restricted to the case where locations are the same.[[16]](#footnote-16) This latter condition holds that interlocational comparisons of zero points are irrelevant to the ranking of worlds. The zero point for value at each location, that is, can be set independently of how it is set for other locations (although, of course, when comparing two worlds, the zero point used for a given location in one world must also be used for that location in the second world). For example, if a location has values of 10 in world U and 5 in world V, both measured on the basis of some particular zero point (the same for both worlds), those values could be changed to 7 and 2 (by making the zero point 3 units higher for that location), and this, according to Translation Scale Invariance, would not alter how the two worlds are ranked.

Zero Independence is equivalent to Translation Scale Invariance (restricted to the case where locations are the same), since any change in the zero points for the locations in worlds U and V can, for some W, be represented by U+W and V+W. (For example, if there are just two people, and the first person’s zero point is decreased by two units, and the second person’s zero point is increased by one unit, then the resulting two representations of the value of U and V are simply U+W and V+W, where W is <2,-1>.) Zero Independence and Translation Scale Invariance thus each hold that U ≥ V if and only if U+W ≥ V+W.

Translation Scale Invariance (and hence, Zero Independence) is highly plausible for finitely additive value theories. (Recall that our goal is to defend a particular extension of finite additivity, not to defend finite additivity against non-additive theories.) **If there is no natural zero point that separates positive from negative value** (if there is just more or less value with no natural separating point), **then any particular zero point is arbitrary** (not representing a real aspect of value). In this case, interlocational comparisons of zero-points are uncontroversially irrelevant. **If**, on the other hand, **there is a natural zero for value, it is still** plausible for finitely additive value theories to hold that it is **irrelevant** for ranking worlds. **What matters** (e.g., **from** a **util**itarian perspective), as argued above, **are** the **differences in value at each location between two worlds—not the absolute level of values** at locations. No interlocational comparison of zero points is needed for this purpose.

Cost-benefit analysis is feasible. Ignore any util calc indicts. **Hardin 90** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

**One** of the **cute**r **charge**s **against util**itarianism **is that** it is irrational in the following sense. **If I take the time to calculate** the consequences of various courses of action before me, **then** I will ipso facto have chosen the course of action to take, namely, to sit and calculate, because while I am calculating the other **courses of action will cease to be open to me. It should embarrass philosophers that they have ever taken this** objection **seriously. Parallel considerations in other realms are dismissed** with eminently good sense. Lord Devlin notes, “If the reasonable man ‘worked to rule’ by perusing to the point of comprehension every form he was handed, the commercial and administrative life of the country would creep **to** a standstill.” James March and Herbert Simon **escape** the quandary of **unending calculation** by noting that often we satisfice, **we do not maximize: we stop calculating** and considering **when we find a merely adequate choice** of action. **When**, in principle, **one cannot know what is** the **best** choice, **one can nevertheless be sure that** sitting and **calculating is not the best choice.** But, one may ask, How do you know that another ten minutes of calculation would not have produced a better choice? And one can only answer, You do not. At some point the quarrel begins to sound adolescent. It is ironic that **the point** of the quarrel **is almost never at issue in practice** (as Devlin implies, **we are** almost all **too reasonable** in practice **to bring the world to a standstill**) but only in the principled discussions of academics.

## Theory Preempts

1. Case outweighs theory.

Embracing environmentalism in round is key to rethinking our lifestyles, so it has an out of round impact.

**Babb 14** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

**We’re actually not all that committed to environmentalism** Though it’s fundamentally beyond the scope of this small contribution, there’s probably something to be said about our underlying attitudes toward the environment. Whether we admit it or not, **we are children of a** very **developed world**. We enjoy the products of environmentally-tainted production on a daily basis. **Our economy and freedom of movement are premised on** a series of **planet-dirtying practices**. On some level, **that has to affect our willingness to tell the story of environmentalism**, to re-issue the edicts that publicly temper our very real commitments to development. We’re all aware of what’s happening to the environment, but we’re only sometimes willing to do very much about it. The difference between the Right and Left on this point is far more a function of ideology than output. Despite the stark disagreements between the two sides, **there remains** a **near**ly **universal unwillingness to seriously alter** our **daily routines** on behalf of the environment. What little we do is often done for us by corporations steered by consumer choice. Indeed, the most effort we typically exert on behalf of the environment is choosing one brand over another. **So** maybe **it shouldn’t be** all that **surprising that debaters are choosing strategy over the environment. The topic has given** our community **a ready-made soapbox for** the **reaffirmation of the environmentalist creed.**

2. Gutcheck against dumb theory. Competing interps leads to a race to the bottom where every round comes down to theory, killing substantive education. Intervention is inevitable in blippy theory debates.

3. The aff doesn’t have to implement a specific policy. Decision rules like the PP are key to the most accurate interp for the topic.

**Nebel 14** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

I hear that many affirmatives on this topic defend the implementation of a particular policy or set of policies in developing countries. The classic framing of this issue has been in terms of an Aims vs. Implementation dichotomy, which has carried over from the Jan/Feb 2013 topic about valuing rehabilitation above retribution. In this article, I’ll explain why I think that is a false dichotomy, and how you can strategically get past this framing of the issue. The most important word in the resolution, for the purposes of this disagreement, is ‘prioritize.’ This is because a topical affirmative advocacy has to do the thing that the resolution says ought to be done. In this case, that’s prioritization. Now, if you just stop there, you might have the following thought: if a topical advocacy just needs to prioritize environmental protection (EP) over resource extraction (RE), then implementing some particular policy that prioritizes EP over RE is, ceteris paribus, topical. But that’s not a good inference. The reason is that what has to do the prioritizing in order to be topical is the agent. Your advocacy must be that the agent prioritize EP over RE, whatever that means. In this case, that agent is ‘developing countries.’ **Just because an agent implements some policy** or set of policies that prioritize EP over RE **does not mean that the agent** itself **prioritizes EP over RE**. This may seem like a picky distinction, but consider some examples. **Suppose I chose to spend time with my friends tonight, rather than work on a paper**. This choice might prioritize friendship over work. But this choice does not make it the case that I prioritize friendship over work. **I might actually** be the kind of person who **prioritize**s **work over friendship, so that I almost always choose to write a paper** when I could instead hang out with friends**, but this** night **is the rare opportunity when I hang out with my friends**. So, just because some choice or action prioritizes one thing over another does not entail that the agent prioritizes one thing over another. If we assume that an advocacy is topical only if it makes it the case that the agent does what the resolution says it ought to do, then this means that implementing a particular policy that prioritizes EP over RE is not enough to be topical. (That is, absent evidence about this policy having the effect of changing developing countries’ priorities as a whole. But then this advocacy might only be effects-topical.) People might respond with a definition of EP or RE in terms of policies. This definition might show that the objects to be prioritized are sets of policies, or some common feature of policies, rather than an abstract aim. But the relevant question is not Aims vs. Implementation: that framing of the topic only persists because of Jan/Feb 2013, on which people defined 'rehabilitation' and 'retribution' as either an aim or a kind of policy. But Aims vs. Implementation is not the correct contrast. The correct contrasts are Aims vs. Policies, and Prioritization vs. Implementation. The point is that prioritizing some kind of policy is not the same as implementing some policy from that set. Aims vs. Policies is a matter of the direct object, whereas Prioritization vs. Implementation is a matter of the verb. **We can agree that EP and RE are sets** or kinds **of policies, but** think **that the resolution is about which we ought to prioritize, not** which we ought to **implement**. However, this does not mean that the anti-policy side completely wins. People who wish to defend an anti-policy interpretation often make their interpretations too strong, by **suggesting** that **no questions of implementation are relevant**. That **seems** to me **false**. To see why, consider a variation on my earlier example about hanging out with my friends or writing a paper. Suppose I used to prioritize work over friendship, but I now prioritize friendship over work. It seems that I am now more likely to spend time with my friends, when this trades off with writing a paper, than I used to be. This is because **an agent’s priorities shape her decisions**. They don’t guarantee that an agent will always choose any particular action that better reflects those priorities. But they will lead to different patterns of actions on the whole. If this is right, then **the most accurate Aims-based interp**retation of the topic **allows that the aff**irmative **advocacy leads to** the **implementation of policies that prioritize EP over RE as an effect**, although the affirmative can’t advocate any particular policy. Implementation of particular policies is an effect, which can be used to garner advantages or disadvantages, but cannot be the affirmative advocacy. And any particular effect of that kind can only be known with some uncertain probability; it cannot be assumed to occur as a matter of fiat.

4. Err aff on theory because of time skew. This also means presume aff if presumption matters.

5. Prefer aff interpretations. Key to clash. **O’Donnell 4** writes[[20]](#footnote-20)

**AFC preserves the value of the first aff**irmative constructive **speech. This speech is the starting point for the debate.** It is a function of necessity. The debate must begin somewhere if it is to begin at all. **Failure to grant AFC** is a denial of the service rendered by the affirmative team’s labor when they crafted this speech. Further, if the affirmative does not get to pick the starting point, **[renders] the opening speech** act is essentially rendered **meaningless while the rest of the debate becomes a debate about what we should be debating about.**

# Extra Card

Studies prove. Many individuals have a preference for the beauty of the environment. This justifies conservation of nature. **Philipp 1** writes[[21]](#footnote-21)

**Natural beauty can be found in many forms**. For example, **people** make trips to **visit landscapes they regard as** especially **beautiful** (Sheppard, 1987). It seems that rhythm and patterns of the blending of shapes, lines, size, colour, texture, light, space and sound in components of the landscape and built environment can give a sense of harmony, balance and proportion, and a hypnotic fusion and flow of form that help to give many people a feeling of peace and inner tranquillity (Snyder, 1930; Storr, 1991; Critchlow and Allen, 1994). Beauty and visual harmony in natural phenomena were, for the ancient Greeks, the most expressive revelation of the divine (Rothschild, 1994). “Truth, Goodness and Beauty (or Strength, Utility and Grace, as they were re-stated by Vitruvius in Roman times), are the three co-necessary values which, according to the Socratic tradition, lead to Harmony. These values have been the underlying perennial wisdom for the western world for three millennia” (Critchlow and Allen, 1994). **This underlying philosophy is the basis for** much **conservation work**, ecological (or ‘green’) tourism, and preservation of our National Parks, 8Maritime and Forest Parks, gardens and wilderness area. It has been reported that “**both art and natural beauty have value in themselves** ... Enriching our aesthetic experience goes together with developing our powers of imagination and understanding ... If we develop our ability to respond to art we shall develop our potential as human beings” (Sheppard, 1987). Albert Einstein is even reported to have said that: “Good imagination is more important than knowledge” (Macara, 1997). Much earlier, Plato had written in ‘The Republic’, “Let our artists rather be those who are gifted to discern the true nature of the beautiful and the graceful; then will our youth dwell in a land of health, amid fair sights and sounds, and receive the good in everything; and the beauty, the effluence of fair works shall flow into the eye and the ear, like a health-giving breeze from a purer region, and insensibly draw the soul from earliest years into likeness and sympathy with the beauty of reason” (Senior, 1996). The healing beauties of nature: The healing beauties of nature and the interdependence of pleasurable personal experience, behaviour and environmental quality were recognised clearly by Greek philosophers. Plato for example, advised us to get out into the countryside. He believed that there, while walking along some pleasant pathway and allowing the beauty of the natural surroundings to be absorbed into our consciousness, we should cultivate a gentle and even walking rhythm. Plato considered that the movements of the body would start to influence gradually the functioning of the mind (Puttock, 2000). Both Plato and Aristotle believed that “philosophy begins in wonder” (Bate, 2000). Perhaps this is why, in the UK, the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest and Natural Beauty in its efforts to provide public access to open countryside, has described unspoiled natural, rural environments as ‘inspiring places’ (Drury, 2000). In the 4th century BC, Epictetus, a Greek philosopher, noted too that: “Men are disturbed not by things, but by the views they take of them” (Palmer, 1991). As the 18th century philosopher, Kant commented: “We see things not as they are, but as we are” (Calman, 1996). These views have been reiterated in contemporary times. At a WHO meeting in Venice in 1998, it was reported that: “Each of us, as we move about, also carries our own ‘panorama’ or view of things” (Ligabue, 1998). Elsewhere, a Japanese author noted that: “The individual can revitalise himself when he is enlightened to the interaction between the person ‘within’ and the circumstances of life ‘without’ (Ikeda, 1981). The English poet, W.H. Davies, brought some of these views together in his poem ‘Leisure’. It begins with the lines: “What is this life if full of care We have no time to stand and stare”. Health gains from tootling and doodling: 9The English word ‘tootle’, encapsulates aspects of this ancient and contemporary philosophy. Defined in the Oxford Dictionary as “to move casually along”, it describes the pleasure that can be derived from using environments of high aesthetic quality to enhance personal experience. ‘Tootling’ can be seen as an activity ‘in which there is environmental opportunity of sufficient aesthetic quality to be able to enjoy oneself, reflect and forget the pressures of daily living, abandon oneself to the pleasures of rhythm and exercise and resonate with the beauty of the natural outdoor environment’ (Philipp et al, 2000). Children are encouraged to develop this sort of environmental understanding with, for example, ‘sensory walks’, during which they “are alerted to underfoot sidewalk texture, pedestrian choreography, smells, sounds, weather, clothes, trees, colours, and art, and experience running, dawdling, asking the way, and the ‘chance dance’ of intersections. The goal is to increase awareness and provide a foundation for personal growth as well as for descriptive, analytical and experimental activities” (Porteous, 1996). A related activity is ‘doodling’, defined by the Oxford Dictionary as “drawing or scrawling absent-mindedly”. It is undertaken by artists, derives from similar environmental opportunities to tootling but as a sedentary activity. Doodling can be thought of as: ‘the free and spontaneous expression with pen or pencil on paper of what the mind is experiencing from its connections of thoughts, feelings and emotions and when allowed to meander gently without specific purpose or intent’. Intriguingly, and perhaps related to this point, Horace wrote in 65 BC that: “Skilled or unskilled, we all scribble poems” (Knowles, 1997). Aristotle divided intellect “into the contemplative and the calculative”. He believed that contemplation is the main ingredient in well-being, “wisdom must be intuitive reason combined with scientific knowledge”, “happiness is good activity, not amusement” and that: “the things that are naturally pleasant are those that stimulate activity of a given nature” (Ross, 1963). Both tootling and doodling are then constructive, worthwhile activities that can help to foster feelings of well-being, eudaimonia and ataraxia. They can, too, lead to personal creativity found: “sometimes flowing spontaneously while in a relaxed, half-awake state when the mind is in ‘stillness’ and untroubled by external stimuli, allowing the gentle surfacing of inner tensions and delights and the outward expression of innovative, imaginative, evocative, inspired and inventive thoughts” (Philipp, 1999). **Environments with appropriate aesthetic qualities** for tootling and doodling **should** therefore **be encouraged!** They provide opportunities to develop and enjoy a health-enhancing resonance within ourselves and with the external factors responsible for that stimulation. This conclusion is supported for example by **one study** which **demonstrated that: “aesthetic satisfactions (e.g.** the contemplation of **scenic beauty)** and emotional satisfactions (e.g. reaching the top of a peak) **were far more important to wilderness hikers than** physical (exercise), educational 10(learning) and **social satisfactions**. It was reported there that: **“these findings have been confirmed** again and again **in a plethora of recreational research** both quantitative and qualitative ... **Aesthetic quality is** almost **universally reduced**, especially in nonurban scenes, **by man-made intrusions** ” (Porteous, 1996).
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